

nonobviousness, these inquiries may have relevancy.” *Graham v. Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966).

“To support the conclusion that the claimed combination is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed combination or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

“To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). ‘All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.’ *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” MPEP § 2143.03.

The Examiner has the duty to present a *prima facie* obviousness rejection. Under *Graham*, this requires determining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. The Examiner has not attempted to read the prior art onto the limitations recited by the claims at issue. Without comparison of the prior art to the claim limitations, the Examiner cannot determine the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue. Therefore the Examiner’s statement that “Fossum teaches all of the claimed limitations of claimed [sic] 1, except for display frame” is unjustified.

Furthermore, the Examiner has not pointed to any teaching in the prior art suggesting the modifications proposed by the Examiner. Furthermore, the Examiner’s statement, “It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the circuit in figure 1 as taught by Dean for the circuit in figure 4 as taught by Fossum because an integrated circuit that included such a circuit architecture could find use in a variety of display system [sic] (col. 2, lines 62-64)” appears to destroy the utility of both Dean and Fossum.

For the reasons stated above, the Examiner’s rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is defective and should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-10, accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable

over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418